Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 7, 22, 23 and 30 are amended. Claims 1-36 are pending; claims 1-6, 12-18, 20 and 21 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 7-11, 19 and 22-36 remain to be considered in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

Regarding the paragraph 2 of the Office Action ("Specification"), the applicant notes that the specification has already been extensively amended to correct informalities.

The applicant notes that the amendments made to the last paragraph of claims 7, 22 and 23, respectively, are for clarity only and are not made to distinguish prior art. The applicant believes that these amendments do not narrow the scope of the respective claims.

Claim 22 was rejected as being anticipated by Tsukihashi (US 6587416). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 22 is directed to an optical disk drive having a link writing function. One feature of the claimed device is that the position for a succeeding writing process is "spaced from an end of data written prior to a data writing interruption by a pattern having a run length greater than a maximum run length value of the drive". An embodiment described in paragraphs [0062] - [0067] of the specification is helpful in understanding this feature (but the claim is not limiter to the embodiments). In this embodiment, a pattern identifying method determines the succeeding writing position by identifying a data length following an interruption that is greater than the maximum run length (MRL) of the device, such as 11T for CD format. Such a blank area is identified by reading the data from the disk and determining if the read data pattern has a run length greater than MRL.

The Tsukihashi reference does not describe or suggest such a feature. The Examiner points to the two zero blocks 150 in Fig. 2 as being the spacer having a run length grater than a maximum run length. The applicant disagrees, because Tsukihashi teaches that these two blocks of zero are encoded by the encoder 12 before written to the disk (see col. 5, lines 1-6). The processing by encoder 12 includes modulation, addition of various codes and signals (col. 3, lines 15-27). There is no indication in the Tsukihashi reference that the two blocks of data 150 physically written to the disk have run lengths greater than the maximum run length. They likely do not. Accordingly, claim 22 is patentable over Tsukihashi.

Claims 30 and 31 were rejected as being anticipated by Andoh (US 6266308). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 30 is directed to an optical disk drive device having a link writing function which includes an encoding link controlled that "detect[s] a pattern from signals read from a disk indicative of the end of a previous interrupted data writing, the pattern having a run length greater than a maximum run length value of normally written data". Claim 30 has been amended to add the underlined portion in the above quote. The embodiment discussed earlier in connection with claim 22 similarly illustrates this feature of claim 30.

Andoh does not teach or suggest such a feature. In rejecting this claim, the Examiner pointed to col. 21, lines 11-18. It is clear from this passage, however, that Andoh does not use a pattern having a run length greater than the maximum run length of normally written data. Here Andoh discusses predetermined periods 3T-11T, which are normal periods for CDs as described in that reference. 11T is the maximum run length for CDs. Accordingly, claims 30 and its dependent claim 31 are patentable over Andoh.

Claims 7, 19, 23 and 29 were rejected as being obvious over Yamamoto (US 6198707) in view of Andoh. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 7 is directed to a link writing method for a recordable or rewritable optical disk. It includes a step of "enabling a succeeding writing process after the writing interruption", where the succeeding writing process includes "searching a linking area with a read data pattern having a run length greater than a maximum run-length value". Independent claim 23 includes similar recitations. The embodiment discussed earlier in connection with claim 22 similarly illustrates this feature of claims 7 and 23.

Yamamoto was cited as a primary reference, but the Examiner recognizes that Yamamoto does not disclose that the writing process comprises searching a linking area using a maximum run length. The Examiner relied on Andoh for teaching this feature. As discussed earlier, however, Andoh does not teach using a pattern having a run length greater than the maximum run length. Accordingly, Yamamoto and Andoh, either taken alone or in combination, do not render claims 7 and 23 obvious. Accordingly, claims 7 and 23, as well as their dependent claims 19 and 29, are patentable over Yamamoto and Andoh.

Claim 32 was rejected as being obvious over Andoh in view of Tsukihashi. Claims 33 and 34 were rejected as being obvious over Andoh in view of Tsukihashi and further in view of Abe (US 5784355). Claims 35 and 36 were rejected as being obvious over Andoh in view of Tsukihashi and further in view of Kawamura (US 4982077). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 32-36 depend from claim 30. As discussed earlier, Andoh does not teach or suggest the step of "detecting a pattern from signals read from a disk indicative of the end of a previous interrupted data writing, the pattern having a run length greater than a maximum run length value of normally written data" required by claim 30. Tsukihashi was discussed earlier in connection with claim 22, and it similarly lacks any teaching or suggestion of the above element of claim 30. The secondary references Abe and Kawamura similarly lack such teaching. Abe

was cited for teaching that zeros are recorded in a state of high reflectivity; it does not have any teaching or suggestion regarding using a run length greater than the maximum run length of normally written data. Kawamura was cited for teaching that zeros are recorded in a state of low reflectivity; it does not have any teaching or suggestion regarding using a run length greater than the maximum run length of normally written data. Accordingly, claims 32-36, which dependent from claim 30, are patentable over the cited references.

Claims 8-11 and 24-28 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. The applicant submits that these claims are allowable in their present form because their base claims are allowable.

The art made of record but not relied upon by the Examiner has been considered. However, it is submitted that this art neither describes nor suggests the presently claimed invention.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 337-6700 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: December 3, 2004

By: _____
Ying Chen
Registration No. 50,193
Attorneys for Applicants

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900
Los Angeles, California 90071
Phone: 213-337-6700
Fax: 213-337-6701